

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been canceled and claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form.

Claim 2 is the only independent claim in the application.

Claims 2 and 3 were not specifically mentioned in the text of the Office Action, either as being rejected or as reciting patentable subject matter. In a telephone interview with the undersigned on December 22, 2003, the Examiner confirmed that he had intended to indicate in the Office Action that claims 2 and 3 recite patentable subject matter. Accordingly, rewriting claim 2 in independent form overcomes all of the rejections of record on prior art grounds.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, on the grounds that its subject matter is not enabled by the description in the specification as filed. In addition, the drawings were objected to as not depicting the subject matter recited in claim 7. Claim 7 has been canceled, as has claim 22 in view of its similarity to claim 7. Therefore, the rejection of claim 7 and the objection to the drawings have been overcome.

This Amendment accordingly responds to all of the points raised in the Office Action and places the application, with claims 2-6, 8-21 and 23-30, in condition for allowance. Therefore, reconsideration of the present application and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Any fees associated with this Amendment may be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-0035.



Correspondence should continue to be directed as shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

ABELMAN, FRAYNE & SCHWAB
Attorneys for Applicant

Thomas E. Spath
Reg. No. 25,928
150 East 42 Street
New York, New York 10017
Tel.: (212) 949-9022